



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

M

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,321	06/13/2000	Brandon William Porter	TM00-003.US	7391
24488	7590	12/21/2004	EXAMINER	
BEVER, HOFFMAN & HARMS, LLP			BOUTAH, ALINA A	
1432 CONCANNON BLVD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BLDG G			2143	
LIVERMORE, CA 94550-6006				

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/592,321	PORTER ET AL.	
	Examiner Alina N Boutah	Art Unit 2143	
-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --			
<b>Period for Reply</b> <p>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.</li> <li>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).</li> <li>- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>			
<b>Status</b> <p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 November 2004</u>.</p> <p>2a)<input type="checkbox"/> This action is <b>FINAL</b>.                  2b)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p>			
<b>Disposition of Claims</b> <p>4)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p>4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.</p> <p>6)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p>			
<b>Application Papers</b> <p>9)<input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10)<input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)<input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b)<input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).</p> <p>11)<input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.</p> <p>12)<input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.</p>			
<b>Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120</b> <p>13)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> All b)<input type="checkbox"/> Some * c)<input type="checkbox"/> None of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.</li> <li>3.<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> </ol> <p>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p> <p>14)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.</p> <p>15)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.</p>			
<b>Attachment(s)</b> <p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>6/24(04</u></p> <p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment received November 15, 2004.

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 15, 2004 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,600,736 issued to Ball et al. (hereinafter Ball).

Regarding claim 1, Ball teaches a method of using a telephone identifying information to preserve state for applications over a telephone interface using a first computer, the method comprising:

identifying a user profile using the first computer and the telephone identifying information (abstract; col. 1, lines 15-53; figure 1; col. 4, lines 5-9);

selecting a state associated with the user profile using the first computer, the state comprising of a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers (abstract; col. 4, line 65 to col. 5, line 29; col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15); and

automatically providing a subset of the plurality of cookies to the application using the first computer, wherein the automatically providing comprises initiating the application on the first computer by interacting with the application using an IETF-compliant HTTP request at least one “cookie” header corresponding to at least one cookie in the subset of the plurality of cookies (col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15). Although Ball does not teach the request being IETF-compliant HTTP request, it is well known in the art that cookies in general are utilized based on IETF RFC 2109 (see RFC 2109). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ IETF-compliant cookies in order to eliminate the need for user to reenter the information, thus speeding up the communication process.

Regarding claim 2, Ball teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the automatically providing is based on a policy for a voice portal, and wherein the policy is dependent on needs of the application on the voice portal, first decisions made by at least one operator of the voice

portal, and second decisions made by users of the voice portal (abstract; col. 3, line 58 to col. 4, line 61).

Regarding claim 3, Ball teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the application has a corresponding uniform resource indicator (URI) and wherein the subset of the plurality of cookies is selected according to applicability of each cookie in the plurality of cookies to the URI (abstract; col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15).

Regarding claim 4, although Ball does not explicitly teach the method of claim 3, wherein the applicability of a cookie for inclusion in the subset is determined according to IETF RFC 2109, it is well known in the art that cookies in general are utilized based on IETF RFC 2109 (see RFC 2109).

Regarding claim 5, Ball teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the applicability of a cookie for inclusion in the subset is determined according to policies in a state management standard (col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15).

Regarding claim 6, Ball teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising storing a new cookie in the plurality of cookies, the new cookie received from the application as part of a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) request for a uniform resource indicator (URI) (col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15).

Regarding claim 7, although Ball does not explicitly teach the method of claim 6, wherein the storing occurs responsive to verification of the new cookie by the first computer according to IETF RFC 2109, it is well known in the art that cookies in general are utilized based on IETF RFC 2109 (see RFC 2109).

Regarding claim 8, Ball teaches the method of claim 6, wherein the storing occurs responsive to verification of the new cookie by the first computer according to policies in a state management standard (col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15).

Regarding claim 9, Ball teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the method further comprises verifying a password for the user profile received over the telephone interface prior to the selecting (col. 4, line 65 to col. 5, line 47).

Regarding claim 10, Ball teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the identifying comprises creating a user profile on the first computer. Bennett teaches creating a user profile on the first computer (col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15).

Regarding claim 11, this is similar to claim 1, therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 12, Ball teaches the apparatus of claim 11, wherein the apparatus supports a second application, the application provided by a first legal entity and the second application provided by a second legal entity (abstract; figure 1).

Regarding claim 13, the IETF fails to teach the apparatus of claim 12, wherein the plurality of cookies includes at least a first cookie set by the second application, and wherein the subset of the plurality of cookies does not include at least a first cookie (col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15).

(Amended) Regarding claim 14, Ball teaches a computer system to preserve state for applications over a telephone interface, the computer system comprising:

an internet interface including at least one program to access a second computer system, the second computer system including an application (abstract; figure 1);

a telephone interface to send and receive audio signals to and from a telephone and to receive a telephone identifying information corresponding to the telephone (figure 1);

and a control subsystem to control the internet interface and the telephone interface, the control subsystem including at least one program for identifying a user profile having a corresponding state, the state comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computer systems, the control subsystem initiating the application on the first computer by interacting with the application using an IETF-compliant HTTP request to a second system, the HTTP request including at least one cookie header corresponding to at least one cookie in the subset of the plurality of cookies (abstract; col. 4, line 65 to col. 5, line 29; col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15).

Although Ball does not teach the request being IETF-compliant HTTP request, it is well known in the art that cookies in general are utilized based on IETF RFC 2109 (see RFC 2109). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ IETF-compliant cookies in order to eliminate the need for user to reenter the information, thus speeding up the communication process.

Regarding claim 15, Ball teaches a computer program for a first computer, the computer program for preserving state for applications over a telephone interface, the computer program comprising:

a first set of instructions for receiving a telephone identifying information from the telephone interface (col. 4, lines 4-9);

a second set of instructions for identifying a user profile according to the telephone identifying information (abstract; col. 1, lines 15-53; figure 1; col. 4, lines 5-9);

a third set of instructions for selecting a state associated with the user profile, the state comprising a plurality of cookies retrieved from other computers (abstract; col. 4, line 65 to col. 5, line 29; col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15); and

a fourth set of instructions for automatically providing a subset of the plurality of cookies to an application, the fourth set of instructions responding to receiving a request over the telephone interface to initiate an application, and initiating the application on the first computer by interacting with the application using an IETF-compliant HTTP request to a second computer, the HTTP request including at least one “cookie” header corresponding to at least one cookie in the subset of the plurality of cookies (col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15). Although Ball does not

teach the request being IETF-compliant HTTP request, it is well known in the art that cookies in general are utilized based on IETF RFC 2109 (see RFC 2109). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ IETF-compliant cookies in order to eliminate the need for user to reenter the information, thus speeding up the communication process.

Regarding claim 16, Ball teaches the computer program of claim 15, wherein the providing is based on a policy for a voice portal, and wherein the policy is dependent on needs of the application on the voice portal, first decisions made by at least one operator of the voice portal, and second decisions made by users of the voice portal (col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15).

Regarding claim 17, Ball teaches the computer program of claim 16, wherein each cookie in the plurality of cookies associated with a corresponding domain, wherein the HTTP request include an HTTP request host and wherein the subset of the plurality of cookies comprises each cookie in the plurality of cookies with a corresponding domain similar to the HTTP request host (col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15).

Regarding claim 18, Ball teaches the computer program of claim 15, wherein the second set of instruction further comprises a set of instructions for creating a new user profile responsive to receiving telephone identifying information not associated with an existing user profile (col. 4, line 65 to col. 5, line 47).

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 19, Ball teaches the computer program of claim 15, wherein the second set of instruction further comprises a set of instructions for creating a temporary user profile responsive to receiving telephone identifying information not associated with an existing user profile and wherein the computer program further comprises a fifth set of instructions for deleting the temporary user profile receiving a signal from the telephone interface signaling an end of a telephone call (col. 9, line 33-col. 10, line 15).

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. USPN 6,707,811 issued to Greenberg et al.
2. USPN 6,807,574 issued to Partovi et al.
3. US 2003/0005163 submitted by Belzile.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alina N Boutah whose telephone number is 571-272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (9:00 am - 7:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ANB



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100